



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/769,826	02/02/2004	William L. Reber	82351	9065	
22242 7:	590 12/01/2004		EXAMINER		
FITCH EVEN	TABIN AND FLAN	NGUYEN, CHANH DUY			
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	60603-3406		2675		

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



		Application	n No	Applicant(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Office Action Summary								
		10/769,82		REBER ET AL.				
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Examiner		Art Unit				
	The MAILING DATE of this communi	Chanh N	• .	2675	dross			
Period fo		cauon appears on the	cover sneet with the	correspondence de	14/C33			
THE - External flags of the continuation of	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION IN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even unication. of days, a reply within the state tutory period will apply and wi will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be t utory minimum of thirty (30) da Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS froi lication to become ABANDON	imely filed ays will be considered time in the mailing date of this of IED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	ly. communication.			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>02 February 20</i> 0	04.					
2a)□								
3)	, <u> </u>							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5) □ 6) ⊠ 7) □ 8) □ Applicat (Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction Fapers The specification is objected to by the the drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any objected to a pending the specification of the specification is objected to by the specification is objected to be specification in the specification in the specification is objected to be specification in the specification in the specification is objected to be specification in the sp	e withdrawn from contion and/or election relation and/or election relation and/or election relation and/or election relation to the drawing(s) beton to the drawing(s) beton to the drawing(s) beton to the drawing(s)	equirement. objected to by the held in abeyance. So	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	FR 1 121(d)			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to			-	• •			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim of All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority of Certified copies of the priority of Some * c) 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action	documents have bee documents have bee of the priority docume nal Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applica ents have been receive 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National	Stage			
Attachmen			_					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P		4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or large No(s)/Mail Date 05/27/04.			Patent Application (PT	O-152)			

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 27,
 2004 have been considered by examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: Although applicant claims 1-3 meet requirement of 112/2nd,i.e. the metes and bounds are determinable, the format of the claim could be improved. Example is the use of dash symbol (-) at the beginning of each line in claim 1 should be avoided so the it eliminates the complex claim format.

It is in the best interest of the patent community the applicant in his/her normal review situations and make changes as necessary. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2675

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deluca et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,952,927) in view of Bluthgen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,636 B2).

As to claim 1, Deluca discloses an apparatus including a wireless receiver (12); a memory (16, 38) operably coupled to the wireless receiver (12) and having a multiword text message stored therein (see column 4,lines 41-51. Deluca teaches a display (22) operably coupled to the memory (16), and being of sufficient size (12 alphanumeric display elements) to accommodate simultaneous display of a plurality of words as comprise the multiword text message (see column 5,lines 23-42). Deluca teaches a processor (32) operably coupled to the memory (16) and the display (22).

Deluca teaches the processor only permitting a single character of the multiword text message to be displayed by the display at a time while claim requires the processor only permits a single word of the multiword text message to be displayed by the display at a time. In same field of endeavor, Bluthgen teaches the text message received from the transmitter (1) may either scroll character by character or word by word (see column 8, lines 16-19). Thus it is clearly that the processor (7-8) of Bluthgen only permits a single word of the multiword text message to be displayed by the display at a time. Since both Deluca and Bluthgen can scroll the text message character by character or word by word. This reads on the limitation "no two words as comprise a

Art Unit: 2675

part of the multiword text message are simultaneously displayed". For example, Bluthgen teaches scroll word by word then one word displays on the screen at a time. Bluthgen's device does not scroll two words by two words. In other words, there is no two words simultaneously displayed in Bluthgen's device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used a processor for scrolling word by word as taught by Bluthgen to the scrolling processor of Deluca so the significant parts of the text information available in the sub data can also be shown on display units on small-sized receivers and remote controllers without the requirement of far-reaching amendments in the sub data format (see column 1, lines 45-50 of Bluthgen).

As to claim 2, Bluthgen clearly teaches the first mode of operation further only permitting the single words of the multiword text message to be displayed in a sequence as corresponds to the multiword text message (i.e. scrolling word by word); see column 8, lines 16-19).

As to claim 3, Bluthgen teaches the processor(7-8) further including display means (10) for presenting only a single word of the multiword text message at a time on the display (i.e. scrolling one word by one word or one word at time on the display, not two words at a time because Bluthgen does not scroll two words by two words); see column 8, lines 16-19.

Inquiries

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chanh Nguyen Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2675

C. Nguyen

November 29, 2004